arXiv:0812.4178v1 [math.NT] 22 Dec 2008

SCHANUEL'S CONJECTURE AND THE EXCEPTIONAL SET OF γ-TH ARITHMETIC ZETA FUNCTIONS

DIEGO MARQUES

Abstract. In this work, we study the arithmetic nature of the numbers of the form n^γ, for $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\gamma \in \mathbb{C}$. We also consider a related conjecture and we show that it is a consequence of the unipresent Schanuel's conjecture.

1. Introduction

An *arithmetic function* is a complex-valued function whose domain is the set of natural numbers $\mathbb{N}$. The set A of all arithmetic functions forms a ring with respect to addition $(+)$ and *Dirichlet's convolution* $(*)$, see [2] and [6], where the Dirichlet's convolution of $f, g \in A$ is defined by

$$(f * g)(n) = \sum_{d|n} f(d)g(n/d)$$

A set of arithmetic functions $f_1, ..., f_m$ is said to be $*$-*algebraically independent over* $\mathbb{C}$ if there exists no non-zero polynomial P with complex coefficients such that

$$P(f_1, ..., f_m) := \sum_{(i)} a_{(i)} f_1^{*i_1} * \cdots * f_m^{*i_m} = 0$$

where $a_{(i)} \in \mathbb{C}$ and $f^{*i} = f * \cdots * f$ (i times).

Let γ be a complex number. The γ-*th arithmetic zeta function* is defined as

$$\zeta_\gamma(n) = n^\gamma$$

Carlitz [1] showed that $\zeta_0, ..., \zeta_r$ are $*$-algebraically independent over $\mathbb{C}$. A generalization for Carlitz's result can be found in [5]. Our interest starts with the definition below

Definition 1. *Le $f : D \to \mathbb{C}$ be a function, with $D \cap \overline{\mathbb{Q}} \neq \emptyset$. We define the exceptional set of f to be*

$$S_f = \{\alpha \in D \cap \overline{\mathbb{Q}} \mid f(\alpha) \in \overline{\mathbb{Q}}\}$$

When $f : \mathbb{C} \to \mathbb{C}$ is an *entire* function, namely analytic in $\mathbb{C}$, then any subset of $\overline{\mathbb{Q}}$ is the exceptional set of uncountable many transcendental functions, see [4]. In this work, we study the possible exceptional sets of γ-th arithmetic zeta functions.

2. Algebraic values of ζ_γ

We are interested in studying the set $S_{\zeta_\gamma} = \{\alpha \in \mathbb{N} \mid f(\alpha) \in \overline{\mathbb{Q}}\}$. For convenience, we write S_γ instead of S_{ζ_γ}. First, we point to some simple facts:

- $S_\gamma \neq \emptyset$, since $1 \in S_\gamma$;

2000 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary 11J81; Secondary 11A25.

Key words and phrases. Zeta arithmetic function, Schanuel's conjecture.

The author is a scholarship holder of the CNPq.

- If $n \in S_\gamma$, then $n^k \in S_\gamma$ for all $k \geq 1$;
- If $n \notin S_\gamma$, then $n^k \notin S_\gamma$ for all $k \geq 1$;
- If $n \in S_\gamma$ and $m \notin S_\gamma$, then $mn \notin S_\gamma$;
- If $Q \in \mathbb{Q}\backslash\{0\}$, then $S_\gamma = S_{Q\gamma}$.

We have two possibilities:

2.1. **The number γ is algebraic.**

For the rational case we use the following lemma

Lemma 1. *Let Q, Q' be rational numbers. Then $Q^{Q'}$ is an algebraic number.*

Proof. Set $Q = a/b$ and $Q' = m/n$. If $Q^{Q'} = T \notin \overline{\mathbb{Q}}$, then we would have that $(a/b)^m = T^n \notin \overline{\mathbb{Q}}$. So $Q^{Q'} \in \overline{\mathbb{Q}}$. □

For the other case we recall a well-known result

Theorem 1 (Gelfond-Schneider)**.** *If $\alpha \in \overline{\mathbb{Q}}\backslash\{0\}$ and $\beta \in \overline{\mathbb{Q}}\backslash\mathbb{Q}$, then $\alpha^\beta \notin \overline{\mathbb{Q}}$.*

We state our first result on the exceptional sets of ζ_γ whose proof follows from the Lemma 1 and by Gelfond-Schneider theorem

Proposition 1. *Let γ be an algebraic number.*

(i) *If $\gamma \in \mathbb{Q}$, then $S_\gamma = \mathbb{N}$;*
(ii) *If $\gamma \in \overline{\mathbb{Q}}\backslash\mathbb{Q}$, then $S_\gamma = \{1\}$.*

2.2. **The number γ is transcendental.**

For this case, we need recall some concepts

Definition 2. *A set of complex numbers $x_1, ..., x_m$ is said to be multiplicatively independent, when the relation $x_1^{a_1} \cdots x_m^{a_m} = 1$ with integer exponents $a_1, ..., a_m$ implies that we must have $a_1 = \cdots = a_m = 0$. Otherwise, it is called multiplicatively dependent.*

Example 1. *The set of all prime numbers is multiplicatively independent. Also any set algebraically independent is multiplicatively independent.*

Remark 1. *The numbers $x_1, ..., x_m$ are multiplicatively independent if, and only if $\log x_1, ..., \log x_m$ are linearly independent over $\mathbb{Q}$.*

The next theorem is an important result on algebraic values of e^t. On this subject, we recall the Lindemann's theorem: if $t \in \overline{\mathbb{Q}}\backslash\{0\}$, then e^t is transcendental. This important result is due to F. Lindemann and it solved the old greek problem of the quadrature of the circle: it is not possible using ruler and compass to draw a square and a circle having the same area. For the case t transcendental, not much is known. For instance, is e^e a transcendental number? So far it is an open problem.

Theorem 2 (Six exponential)**.** *Let β_1, β_2 be complex numbers, linearly independent over $\mathbb{Q}$, and let z_1, z_2, z_3 be complex numbers, also linearly independent over $\mathbb{Q}$. Then at least one of the numbers*

$$e^{\beta_1 z_1}, e^{\beta_1 z_2}, e^{\beta_1 z_3}, e^{\beta_2 z_1}, e^{\beta_2 z_2}, e^{\beta_2 z_3}$$

is transcendental.

Now, we are able to state

Proposition 2. *Let γ be a transcendental number. Then any three numbers in S_γ must be multiplicatively dependent.*

Proof. Let n_1, n_2, n_3 be natural numbers multiplicatively independent, so $\log n_1$, $\log n_2, \log n_3$ are linearly independent over $\mathbb{Q}$. Also, $1, \gamma$ are linearly independent over $\mathbb{Q}$. Therefore, by Theorem 2, there exists at least one transcendental number among $e^{\log n_1}, e^{\log n_2}, e^{\log n_3}, e^{\gamma \log n_1}, e^{\gamma \log n_2}, e^{\gamma \log n_3}$. Hence one of the numbers $n_1^{\gamma}, n_2^{\gamma}, n_3^{\gamma}$ is transcendental. In other words, at least one of the numbers n_1, n_2, n_3 is not in S_γ. $\square$

As consequences, we have

Corollary 1. *If γ is a transcendental number, then $\mathbb{N} \backslash S_\gamma$ is an infinite set.*

Corollary 2. *We have $S_\gamma = \mathbb{N}$ if, and only if $\gamma \in \mathbb{Q}$.*

It follows also by Proposition 2 that at most two of the numbers $2^\pi, 3^\pi, 5^\pi, \ldots$ are algebraic. Note that when $\gamma \notin \overline{\mathbb{Q}}$, then we can have that S_γ is an infinite set. For instance, $\{1, 2, 4, 8, \ldots\} \subseteq S_{\frac{\log 3}{\log 2}}$. This simple example encourage us to making a related conjecture, which in particular implies that $S_{\frac{\log 3}{\log 2}} = \{1, 2, 4, 8, \ldots\}$.

Conjecture 1. *If $\gamma \notin \mathbb{Q}$, then there exists $B \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $S_\gamma = \{B^k \mid k \geq 0\}$.*

When $\gamma \in \overline{\mathbb{Q}} \backslash \mathbb{Q}$, then $B = 1$. For the general case we have a hard problem, because until now we do not know the arithmetic nature of at least one of numbers of the form n^π (surely for $n \neq 1$). So, it would be great to prove this conjecture, but unfortunately we do not prove it (yet). Instead of that, in next section we relate the unipresent Schanuel's conjecture with the conjecture above.

3. Schanuel's conjecture × Exceptional set of ζ_γ

We recall the statement of Schanuel's conjecture which is one of the most outstanding problem in transcendental number theory. For facilitating our work, we denote $\#\{x_1, \ldots, x_m\}$ as the transcendence degree over $\mathbb{Q}$ of the field $\mathbb{Q}(x_1, \ldots, x_m)$.

Conjecture 2 (Schanuel). *Let $x_1, \ldots, x_n$ be $\mathbb{Q}$-linearly independent complex numbers. Then*

$$\#\{x_1, \ldots, x_n, e^{x_1}, \ldots, e^{x_n}\} \geq n$$

Schanuel's conjecture implies many famous theorems and conjectures about transcendental numbers. For an interesting consequence see [3]. From now on, we use this conjecture to proving some interesting facts on the exceptional set of the functions ζ_γ.

Proposition 3. *Suppose that Schanuel's conjecture is true. If $n \geq 2$ and $\gamma_1, \ldots, \gamma_k$ are algebraic numbers such that $1, \gamma_1, \ldots, \gamma_k$ are linearly independent over $\mathbb{Q}$, then the numbers $\log n, \zeta_{\gamma_1}(n), \ldots, \zeta_{\gamma_k}(n)$ are algebraically independent.*

Proof. Since $\log n, \gamma_1 \log n, \ldots, \gamma_k \log n$ are linearly independent over $\mathbb{Q}$, then by Schanuel's conjecture

$$\#\{\log n, \gamma_1 \log n, \ldots, \gamma_k \log n, n, \zeta_{\gamma_1}(n), \ldots, \zeta_{\gamma_k}(n)\} \geq k + 1$$

However $n, \gamma_1, \ldots, \gamma_k \in \overline{\mathbb{Q}}$ and then $\log n, \zeta_{\gamma_1}(n), \ldots, \zeta_{\gamma_k}(n)$ must be algebraically independent. $\square$

Proposition 4. *Suppose that Schanuel's conjecture is true. If* $\gamma \notin \overline{\mathbb{Q}}$ *and* $n_1, ..., n_k \in \mathbb{N}$ *are multiplicatively independent, then*

$$\#\{\zeta_\gamma(n_1), ..., \zeta_\gamma(n_k)\} \geq k - 1$$

Proof. Since $n_1, ..., n_k$ are multiplicatively independent, then $\log n_1, ..., \log n_k$ are linearly independent over $\mathbb{Q}$. Next, order the numbers $\log n_1, ..., \log n_k$ in a such way that $\{\log n_1, ..., \log n_k, \gamma \log n_1, ..., \gamma \log n_t\}$ is a basis of the vector space generated by $\{\log n_1, ..., \log n_k, \gamma \log n_1, ..., \gamma \log n_k\}$ over $\mathbb{Q}$. Since γ is a transcendental number, then there exists a transcendence basis $\{\log n_{i_1}, ..., \log n_{i_s}, \gamma\}$ of $\mathbb{Q}(\log n_1, ..., \log n_k, \gamma)|\mathbb{Q}$. Therefore $\log n_1, ..., \log n_k, \gamma \log n_{i_1}, ..., \gamma \log n_{i_s}$ are linearly independent over $\mathbb{Q}$ and then $s \leq t$. On the other hand, it follows from Schanuel's conjecture that

$$\#\{\log n_1, ..., \log n_k, \gamma \log n_1, ..., \gamma \log n_t, n_1, ..., n_k, n_1^\gamma, ..., n_t^\gamma\} \geq t + k$$

So, $\#\{\log n_1, ..., \log n_k, \gamma \log n_1, ..., \gamma \log n_k, n_1^\gamma, ..., n_k^\gamma\} \geq t + k$. However

$$\#\{\log n_1, ..., \log n_k, \gamma \log n_1, ..., \gamma \log n_k\} = \#\{\log n_1, ..., \log n_k, \gamma\} = s + 1$$

Hence, it follows that $\#\{\zeta_\gamma(n_1), ..., \zeta_\gamma(n_k)\} \geq t + k - (s + 1) \geq k - 1$ □

Considering that $\log n$ is a transcendental number for all $n \geq 2$ (Lindemann's theorem) and using a similar argument to the one of the previous proof, we get another interesting result

Proposition 5. *Suppose that Schanuel's conjecture is true. If* $n \geq 2$ *and* $\gamma_1, ..., \gamma_k$ *are linearly independent, then*

$$\#\{e^{\gamma_1}, ..., e^{\gamma_k}, \zeta_{\gamma_1}(n), ..., \zeta_{\gamma_k}(n)\} \geq k - 1$$

Now we prove that Conjecture 1 is also a consequence of the powerful Schanuel's conjecture

Proposition 6. *Schanuel's conjecture implies Conjecture 1.*

Proof. If γ is algebraic, then $B = 1$. In the case $\gamma \notin \overline{\mathbb{Q}}$ and $S_\gamma \neq \{1\}$, we take $B \in S_\gamma$ in a such way that $B^{1/k} \notin \mathbb{N}$ for all $n \geq 2$. For any $n \in S_\gamma$ the numbers B, n are multiplicatively dependent. In fact, on the contrary by Proposition 4 we would have $\#\{\zeta_\gamma(B), \zeta_\gamma(n)\} \geq 1$, so at least one of the numbers B, n would not be in S_γ. Let a/b be a rational number with $\gcd(a, b) = 1$ and such that $n = B^{a/b}$. Therefore $B^{1/b} \in \mathbb{N}$ and then $b = 1$. It follows that $n = B^a$, so $S_\gamma = \{B^k \mid k \geq 0\}$. □

Let γ be a non-rational complex number. We name *exceptional representant* of γ as the number $B = B(\gamma)$ in Conjecture 1, if any. Assuming the truth of Schanuel's conjecture, we just proved the existence of exceptional representant for any non-rational complex number. It is easy see that if the exceptional representant of α and β are multiplicatively independent, then $S_\alpha \cap S_\beta = \{1\}$. We finish our work expliciting S_γ for some well-known γ's.

Proposition 7. *If Schanuel's conjecture is true, then the numbers* $\zeta_\pi(n), \zeta_e(n), \zeta_i(n)$ *are algebraically independent over* $\mathbb{Q}(e, \pi)$*, for all* $n \geq 2$*. In particular,* $S_\pi = S_i = S_e = \{1\}$.

Proof. If $n \geq 2$, then $i\pi, \log n$ are $\mathbb{Q}$-linearly independent, so by Schanuel's conjecture $\#\{i\pi, \log n, -1, n\} \geq 2$. It follows that $\pi, \log n$ are algebraic independent. Thus $i\pi, \log n, \log \pi, \log\log n$ are $\mathbb{Q}$-linearly independent. By Schanuel's conjecture $\#\{i\pi, \log n, \log \pi, \log\log n, -1, n, \pi, \log n\} \geq 4$ and then $1, i\pi, \log n, \log \pi, \log\log n$ are $\mathbb{Q}$-linearly independent. Again, by Schanuel's conjecture the numbers $i\pi, \log n$, $\log \pi, \log\log n$ are algebraically independent. Thus, for finishing, the numbers $i\pi, \pi \log n, e \log n, i \log n, \log \pi, \log\log n, 1, \log \pi, \log n$ are $\mathbb{Q}$-linearly independent. By Schanuel's conjecture the numbers n^{π}, n^{e}, n^{i} are algebraically independent over $\mathbb{Q}(e, \pi)$. ☐

Acknowledgement

I would like to thank Ana Paula Chaves by the helpful discussion on the improvement of the english of the work.

References

1. L. Carlitz. “Independence of arithmetic functions.” *Duke Math. J* **19**, 65-70 (1952).
2. E. D. Cashewll, C. J. Everett. “The ring of number-theoretic functions”, *Pacific J. Math.***9**, 975-985 (1959).
3. C. Cheng, B. Dietel, M. Herblot, J. Huang, H. Krieger, D. Marques, J. Mason, M. Mereb, S. R. Wilson. “Some consequences of Schanuel's conjecture”, *Journal of Number Theory* (To appear)
4. J. Huang, D. Marques, M. Mereb. “Algebraic values of transcendental functions at algebraic points.” http://arxiv.org/abs/0808.2766 (2008).
5. V. Laohakosol, K. Kongsakorn, U. Leerawat. “Algebraic independence test of arithmetic functions using Jacobians.” *J. Sci. Soc. Thailand* **15**, 133-138 (1989).
6. P. J. McCarthy. *Introduction to arithmetic functions.* Springer-Verlag, New York (1985).

DEPARTAMENTO DE MATEMÁTICA, UNIVERSIDADE FEDERAL DO CEARÁ, FORTALEZA, CEARÁ, BRAZIL
E-mail address: `diego@mat.ufc.br`